



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,915	06/27/2003	Yoshihiro Kobayashi	TJK/395	8119
27717	7590	04/24/2006	EXAMINER	
SEYFARTH SHAW LLP 55 E. MONROE STREET SUITE 4200 CHICAGO, IL 60603-5803			CLEVELAND, MICHAEL B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1762	

DATE MAILED: 04/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/607,915	KOBAYASHI, YOSHIHIRO
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael Cleveland	1762

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 12 and 16-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 12 and 16-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- .9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/13/2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 12 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarnecki (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0089252, hereafter '252) in view of Towns et al. (U.S. Patent 6,153,711, hereafter '711), and Park et al. (U.S. Patent 5,053,298, hereafter '298).

'252 teaches forming an electroluminescent element by intaglio printing a light-emitting material [0008, 0010]. '252 does not explicitly teach that the ink has a viscosity of 0.5-500 cP. However, '252 does teach that the viscosity should be chosen to be a suitable viscosity for gravure printing and that such viscosities are taught by Towns '711 [0020]. Towns '711 teaches ink viscosities of 1-200 cP (col. 2, lines 56-67). The selection of something based on its known suitability for its intended use has been held to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Sinclair & Carroll Co. v. Interchemical Corp., 325 U.S. 327, 65 USPQ 297 (1945). See MPEP 2144.07. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have chosen a viscosity of 1-200 cP as the particular viscosity of '252 with a reasonable expectation of success because '711 teaches that 1-200 cP are suitable printing ink viscosities and because '252 teaches using the viscosities of '711.

Art Unit: 1762

‘252 and ‘711 are described above. ‘252 teaches that multiple colors are applied and that each color is dried (i.e., hardened) before the next color is applied [0022], but does not teach that a later color is printed after a protective layer is placed over the already printed colors. However, ‘298 teaches that in printing different colored pixels, each pixel should be covered to protect it during the deposition of the subsequent pixel (col. 3, line 29-col. 4, line 28). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have covered each pixel with a protective film before printing the subsequent pixel because ‘298 teaches that such is a suitable method for protecting each already-deposited pixel during the deposition of subsequent pixels.

Claim 16: ‘252 teaches that the depth of the cells is a result-effective variable because it controls the thickness of the film formed [0011]. It has been held that the discovery of the optimum value of a result effective variable in a known process is ordinarily within the skill in the art. *In re Boesch and Slaney*, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have optimized the depth of the cells of ‘252 to have achieved the desired thicknesses of [0022].

Claim 17: The intaglio is formed into plural cells to print pixels [0009], [0011].

Claims 18: Separate stations may be used for each color [0022]. Thus, the area of the group of cells that provide ink from one printing plate is smaller than the total area of the light-emitting layer on the formed device because the total area of the emitting pixels comprises all three colors.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 2/13/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments regarding the amended claims are unconvincing in view of Park ‘298, as suggested in the prior office action, and fully described above.

Art Unit: 1762

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Cleveland whose telephone number is (571) 272-1418. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on (571) 272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Michael Cleveland
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1762

4/20/2006